DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 399 EC 301 128

TITLE Higher Education and State Agency Cooperation for Part H Personnel Preparation.
INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Carolina Inst. for Child and Family Policy.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 92
CONTRACT G0087C3065
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; Change Strategies; *Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; *Disabilities; *Early Intervention; Educational Cooperation; Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; *Higher Education; Preschool Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Development; Staff Development; *State Agencies; Statewide Planning; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part H

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between state agencies and higher education in planning for the personnel components of Part H of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The study used a qualitative research design, involving five states, to examine the process of developing and maintaining working relationships between state agencies and higher education and to uncover strategies for successful cooperation. The study found that collaborative planning action was relative to a number of common issues, including the procedural challenges of certification and access to resources of time, expertise, and funding. Efforts were facilitated by experienced leadership, early collaborative events, a planning structure that drew upon representation from invested parties, and procedures to formally delineate duties for cooperative planning and implementation efforts. Policy recommendations include: (1) states should form a consortium of state agency, higher education, and professional organization representatives to address statewide planning for special education; (2) states should provide higher education with financial incentives to increase personnel preparation programs; and (3) a procedure should be established to develop a semiformal link between state agencies and higher education in terms of needs and mutual goals on collaborative projects. The interview questionnaire is provided in an appendix. (12 references) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED344399

Carolina Institute for Child and Family Policy

HIGHER EDUCATION AND STATE AGENCY COOPERATION FOR PART H PERSONNEL PREPARATION

ROBIN ROONEY
JAMES J. GALLAGHER
PATRICIA FULLAGAR
JANE ECKLAND
GAIL HUNTINGTON

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

EC 301128

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHER EDUCATION AND STATE AGENCY COOPERATION FOR PART H PERSONNEL PREPARATION

ROBIN ROONEY
JAMES J. GALLAGHER
PATRICIA FULLAGAR
JANE ECKLAND
GAIL HUNTINGTON

February 1992

Carolina Policy Studies Program is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, Cooperative Agreement #G0087C3065. However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

PURPOSE 1

BACKGROUND 1

METHOD 5

- Research Design 5
- Sample 5
- Data Collection 6
- Data Analysis 6

FINDINGS 7

- Within State Trends 7
- Cross State Analysis 22

DISCUSSION 25

- Attributes of Successful Collaborative Personnel Planning for Part H 25
- Common Issues Addressed by States In Planning for Personnel Development 27
- Policy Implications 29

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS 30

REFERENCES 32

APPENDIX A - Interview Questionnaire 34

Executive Summary

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between state agencies and higher education in planning for the personnel components of Part H of IDEA. It was our mission to uncover strategies for successful cooperation from states that were demonstrating progress in meeting the personnel challenges of Part H.

The nature of this law requires novel approaches to early intervention, including interdisciplinary service delivery. Successful implementation of the law will depend on states' ability to put adequately staffed programs in place. The law calls for comprehensive service delivery, yet there are major shortages of personnel qualified to perform early intervention services (Gallagher, Harbin, Thomas, Clifford & Wenger, 1988; Bailey, Simeonsson, Yoder, & Huntington, 1990).

A timely and effective response to critical personnel shortages requires involved parties, such as state agencies and universities, to work together. Collaboration between the lead agency and training institutions was said to be crucial to efforts to increase the personnel pool for the purpose of enabling implementation of programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The phenomenon of cooperation, particularly between higher education and state agencies, was identified by Bruder, Klosowski and Daguio (1989) as a critical factor in states' progress in addressing personnel preparation components of Part H. Key players in states that were moving forward in personnel planning demonstrated a willingness to work together for a common purpose.

The major focus of this study was to describe the phenomenon of cooperation and its manifestations: specific instances of collaboration between groups for personnel planning for Part H. A qualitative research design was employed to examine the issues associated with the process of developing and maintaining

working relationships between these two sectors. Five cases were selected from a pool of states nominated by early intervention experts as having demonstrated cooperation in planning for personnel. Data were collected through an in-depth interviewing process with participants in Part H personnel planning efforts, and a review of related documents.

Each state presented a rich scenario of existing conditions and action that allowed planning to occur collaboratively. Action was found to be relative to a number of common issues challenging personnel planners across the states, including the procedural challenges of certification and access to resources of time, expertise, and funding. Analysis of interview data and documents further revealed facilitating trends that contributed to states' success in planning for personnel preparation. Efforts were facilitated by experienced leadership, early collaborative events, a planning structure that drew upon representation from invested parties (higher education, state agencies and professional organizations), and procedures to formally delineate duties for cooperative planning and implementation efforts.

Policy recommendations derived from this study included:

1) that states should form a consortium of state agency, higher education, and professional organization representatives to address statewide planning for special education
2) that states should provide higher education with financial incentives (i.e., stipends, faculty funding) to increase personnel preparation programs
3) that a procedure should be established, such as a "memorandum of understanding" to establish a semi-formal link between state agencies and higher education in terms of needs and mutual goals on collaborative projects.

PURPOSE

Part H of IDEA, passed as Public Law 99-457 in 1986, mandated early intervention for infants and toddlers with disabilities, and their families. Passage of P.L. 99-457 heralded expansion of quality services to meet the needs of exceptional children from birth, incorporating guidelines for coordinated and comprehensive service delivery into the law.

Part H of IDEA calls for comprehensive restructuring of service delivery to young children with handicapping conditions and their families. Requirements for personnel preparation speak to comprehensive service delivery: major players in personnel development must collaborate to train professionals, in keeping with the spirit and letter of the law. Cooperation between state agencies and higher education specifically has been identified as essential to personnel development (Bruder, Klosowski & Daguio, 1989). This phenomenon is the focus of the present study in which the purpose is to identify critical factors associated with cooperation in planning for personnel development for Part H. Our mission was to provide recommendations to states for facilitating collaboration between state agency and higher education structures in order to facilitate progress toward compliance with the personnel preparation components of Part H.

BACKGROUND

The components of Part H call for the integration of services to young children with disabilities. This integration includes interagency cooperation and interdisciplinary personnel preparation. As states rise to meet the challenging aspects of this law, it becomes increasingly evident that traditional service systems must change. It has become increasingly evident that state agencies and higher education must become interwoven systems with permeable boundaries.

The personnel preparation components of the law challenge Part H planners to produce: (a) standards for early intervention personnel (Sec. 676b [13]), and (b) a Comprehensive System for Personnel Development, (CSPD), (Sec. 676b [8]). These requirements speak to interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration in both planning and implementation of personnel development. This is uncharted territory for many states and, not surprisingly, they have responded slowly to Part H personnel development (Gallagher, 1989; Harbin, Gallagher & Lillie, 1991).

Slow progress in personnel planning may be attributed to a variety of barriers. The law calls for comprehensive service delivery, yet there are major shortages of personnel qualified to perform early intervention services (Gallagher, Harbin, Thomas, Clifford & Wenger, 1988; Bailey, Simeonsson, Yoder, & Huntington, 1990). Inservice personnel preparation to fill the early intervention gaps is a plausible but limited solution in the face of major shortages across the country of allied health professionals (Yoder, Coleman & Gallagher, 1990). Although it is clear that both preservice and inservice personnel preparation efforts must accelerate if Part H is to be implemented, there has been subdued response from higher education leaders, who are reluctant to commit to programs without long term commitment from the federal government (Gallagher & Staples, 1990).

States must determine personnel standards and competencies for early intervention professionals from a variety of disciplines, including special education and allied health. To begin this task, states may look to national professional associations as a resource for discipline-specific personnel standards. However, according to a recent study of 10 professional associations (Gallagher & Coleman, 1990), only 50% of these groups were taking a position on the delivery of services to young children, and this was primarily through the development of guidelines for quality early intervention. The other half of the associations reported no immediate plans to address the possible influx of infants and toddlers and their families who need

and are entitled to services. One organization, the Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children (DEC) stepped beyond a statement of guidelines to recommend the creation of a new position specific to early intervention. The occupational category of Early Childhood Special Educator was proposed, for which personnel would train in educational foundations, life-span development and learning, professional orientation and development, exceptionalities, methods, assessment, health and environment management, and interdisciplinary teaming (Gallagher & Coleman, 1990).

Achieving interagency collaboration and cooperation complicates, yet is pivotal to, the success of Part H. There are multiple players that contribute to the preparation of early intervention personnel. Each state's lead agency must initiate the appropriate steps to involve responsible parties in interdisciplinary service planning and delivery. Invested parties include a variety of state agencies who license, credential and/or employ professionals. State departments of public instruction, for example, are responsible for credentialing public school personnel, often including early childhood/preschool handicapped classroom teachers. State departments (e.g., health, human resources) also license or certify and employ personnel such as allied health professionals. State agencies often must approve and accredit institutions that provide the personnel preparation according to standards set by the state. In addition to state requirements, there are national standards set by professional organizations. National associations, such as the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, monitor personnel preparation for the purposes of professional certification. Higher education is in the business of providing programs to prepare health and education professionals.

Depending on standards for entry level positions, programs may include two-year, four-year, and masters level preservice personnel preparation across disciplines. Inservice personnel preparation may be provided by higher education, or contracted

with private providers through state agencies or brokers. Coordination across invested parties is complicated by problems associated with achieving a balance of power. State agencies are responsible for supplying personnel to service delivery programs, but are not responsible for funding universities to establish or enhance personnel preparation. Universities need funding and time to initiate preservice programs. Steps to begin a program are a complex series of procedures including: faculty approval, university approval, hiring or reassigning of faculty, development of curricula, establishment of credentials, recruitment of students, and program execution. Each step in the design and implementation of such programs requires faculty salary and money for materials development and may take at least a year (Gallagher, 1989). Both state agencies and higher education are limited by constraints of time, funding, and authority in forging ahead with personnel preparation.

A review of the history of the state government and higher education relationship shows firm boundaries traditionally characterized by issues of autonomy and accountability (Slaughter, 1988; Fisher, 1988). These issues are pertinent to Part H planners in the preparation, licensing and credentialing of early interventionists, particularly in the area of special education. As noted above, discipline-specific personnel preparation programs, such as those for allied health professionals, are approved by national professional associations with licensure standards. With standards and accrediting processes in the hands of strong national organizations (e.g., the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association), allied health personnel development is less dependent upon the success of working relationships between trainers and state government. However, the importance of such relationships remains crucial to service delivery efforts, considering the large numbers of early intervention practitioners coming from the field of education. A study of staffing patterns in North Carolina, for example, revealed that a majority of practitioners were trained in special and regular education (Palsha & Rennells, 1990). The process of

certification requires a close working relationship between the agency granting certification and the institution providing the required personnel preparation. State agencies set minimum standards for higher education to meet in their programs leading to certification. They may then act as regulators of higher education, limiting autonomy and increasing accountability through the process of approval and accreditation of personnel preparation programs for certification or licensure. Assuring quality personnel for early intervention programs often falls on the shoulders of state agencies in collaboration with higher education.

METHOD

RESEARCH DESIGN

A qualitative research design was implemented to study the phenomenon of cooperation between higher education and state agencies. Five case study states were selected from a field of nominations submitted by nationally known early intervention experts, such as advisory board members from this and other research institutes. The states selected were among those reported by nominators to have exhibited a cooperative effort in personnel planning.

SAMPLE

Progress typically was evidenced by a complete or near complete collaboratively developed personnel plan, such as the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Plan (CSPD) required to be submitted by states to the federal government and to the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for approval. Such documents supplied the data for the study, as did interviews with key persons identified by Part H coordinators as having participated in the planning process for personnel preparation. Key persons included both higher education and state agency

representatives, who had been involved in a formal planning structure for Part H, such as the personnel preparation subcommittee of that state's ICC.

The five case study states were arbitrarily assigned code names for the purpose of anonymity and confidentiality in reporting. The selected cases included a mid-size state in the South referred to as "Dickens," a large midwestern state, called "Patent," a mid-Atlantic state, "Galena," a large state in the Northwest called, for the purposes of this study, "Gerard," and a midwestern state, "Roald."

DATA COLLECTION

Interviews with 8 to 10 individuals per state were conducted by telephone. These interviews were guided by a protocol that was developed through a review of the literature specific to the phenomenon of cooperation, quality personnel preparation, and a history of the relationship between higher education and states. This protocol was sent to scheduled interviewees after securing their agreement to participate in the study, and prior to their telephone appointment. (Please see the Appendix for a sample of this protocol.) Interviews ranged in duration from .5 to 1.5 hours. Typically, respondents tended not to follow the structure of the questionnaire closely, but responded generally to the questionnaire's inherent areas of inquiry.

DATA ANALYSIS

Interview data were converted into systematic categories of analysis. Seven categories of information emerged in response to the areas of inquiry as guided by the protocol: (a) origin and history of the relationship between higher education and that state's agencies, (b) key figures and groups who facilitated cooperation, (c) formalization of collaborative efforts, (d) maintenance of working relationships between institutions of higher education and state agencies, (e) the financial dimension of planning for personnel, (f) outcomes of the cooperative effort, and (g)

barriers to successful planning. Further analysis of the data involved subcategorization of responses. For example, in the "origin and history" category subsets of information such as "groups involved," "policies existing prior to Part H of IDEA," or "existing conditions," could be identified. This method of analysis allowed dominant themes and patterns to emerge from the data; subsets of information were then subsumed into categorical themes and patterns. Analysis of these patterns told the story of each case study state. Central to the stories were trends of existing conditions in that state that facilitated or impeded action by key participants for personnel planning outcomes.

Findings from each state were compared in a cross-state analysis. Emerging trends and patterns were analyzed for each area of inquiry and assigned a piece of interview text, a paraphrase or partial quote, to characterize the significant meaning of the trend for that state. Significance was judged by the frequency of occurrence of responses referring to the same trend across respondents in a state. Text was entered on a matrix and compared across states (see Table 1). This process supported the notion of variation in states' progress as a reflection of enabling actions and outcomes specific to existing conditions in that state, as revealed by within-state findings. Conclusions are discussed in this report under the section titled, "Interpretation."

FINDINGS

WITHIN-STATE TRENDS

Each of the five states presented a contextual story of personnel planning specific to the culture of that state. Culture was evidenced in conditions that existed prior to the passage of Part H that contributed to a state's ability to act on the challenges of the new law. A state's political climate, for example, its philosophy for regular and special education, and its tradition for serving the people of the state contributed to a capacity for adaptation and change. The planners constructed

processes to effect change within the context of state culture. Below are case study findings, organized according to significant trends emerging under each of the seven areas of inquiry: (a) origin and history, (b) key figures, (c) formalization, (d) maintenance, (e) finance, (f) outcomes, and (g) barriers to successful planning.

"Dickens"

Origin and history. A dominant theme in "Dickens" was the existence of an established network of people committed to early intervention. This network included both state agency and higher education personnel in research-oriented relationships often associated with experimental preschool projects. Planning and development were activities central to the early intervention network. It was notable that a system of people, rather than of services, existed in this state.

Key figures. Among the cadre of planners and developers were a number of nationally known figures whose "Dickens" residency attracted other early childhood intervention innovators to the state. Their organized interactions through Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) projects, university based experimental programs and, most recently, planning for Part H generated repeated contact that has kept the network interactive, yet stable, with little dissension.

Formalization. Interactive relationships were well established in "Dickens." Formal planning events such as an early conference targeting personnel development and meetings of the personnel development subcommittee of the ICC continued in the collaborative tradition. Formal planning was a dynamic process and progressed successfully according to procedures that had been established for special projects in the past. Established procedures to reciprocate services between agencies and universities were applied to Part H planning. An example of this was a Memorandum of Understanding, a semi-formal contract that spelled out duties to be performed by the participating state agency and university personnel in order to contribute to a mutual

goal. Built into the memorandum was an option for re-evaluating and/or terminating the agreed-upon conditions that could be initiated by either party.

Maintenance. Continuity of established working relationships was achieved, as standard planning processes created prior to Part H were applied to current planning. Reciprocal participation of state agency and higher education representatives in planning for special services was one of the established practices. The increased need for personnel presented a new problem for the early intervention network. Its challenges became an additional item on an already extensive planning agenda. The ongoing activity of common membership working on common goals maintained working relationships in "Dickens."

Finance. Funding was not described as a barrier to cooperation. Respondents reported, in fact, that contracts and agreements to exchange services, as well as the donation of time and expertise, had contributed to the distribution of resources.

Outcomes. Collaborative planning efforts resulted in further planning, personnel preparation events, and a process for establishing credentials for specialization in infant development. Plans for a comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD) had been submitted and approved by the ICC, and national personnel preparation opportunities for faculty in early intervention were emerging from "Dickens." Increased interagency cooperation was another effect of collaborative planning. Higher education acted as a third party to help link various state agencies and department divisions such as Public Instruction, Human Resources, and Maternal and Child Health.

Barriers. The complexity of interagency coordination hindered the flow of information for personnel preparation planning, and tended to slow the rate of change. With three different departments involved in early intervention service delivery (Public Instruction, Human Resources, and Maternal and Child Health) it was difficult to cover all the bases when disseminating information. Each separate department operated

under similar, yet distinct, administrative procedures, so that accomplishing a collaborative task often meant overcoming an unwieldy bureaucratic maze .

Summary. An established network of higher education and state agency players turned energies toward personnel planning for Part H. The strength of this state's approach to planning seemed to lie in the willingness of players to meet and interact. There was a research orientation resulting from earlier collaborative projects, which continued to manifest itself in the development of personnel preparation methods that originated from the university sector.

"Patent"

Origin and history. This state's history was characterized by a general self-image reflecting progressive innovation. Its early intervention route developed through experimental projects that increased awareness of, and involved personnel in, early intervention. Commitment to special education was symbolically cemented in the early 70s by action on the part of a key leader who held the position of Assistant State Superintendent of Schools. Because of his special interest in special education and early childhood programs, he voluntarily changed to a position of lower status and salary as supervisor of special programs. He contributed to the expansion of the special education frontier by inspiring others to rally around the cause of special education.

Key figures. Strong, action-oriented leadership from both state agencies and higher education influenced personnel planning for Part H. Leaders from both sectors took positions on how to address the personnel challenges of Part H. Key figures from the lead agency (Department of Health and Social Services) voiced doubt about turning personnel planning for Part H over to higher education. There was concern that a higher education focus might not reflect the needs of practitioners in the field. University leaders from a prominent early intervention-focused university-affiliated

program (hereafter referred to as the UAP) made a case for personnel development based on the impact of personnel shortages. The lead agency conducted a request for proposals in an open competition for personnel development leadership. The UAP was awarded the contract. The relationship between the lead agency and the university began on a note of apprehension. The lead agency expressed concern about potential conflict of interest on the part of the UAP, as well as concern about a university project reflecting the needs of the field. Through the process of developing a contract and meeting its requirements for grant money, the relationship evolved into a significant collaborative effort.

Formalization. The lead agency awarded a sizable contract to the UAP to carry out a number of functions related to personnel development for Part H. The request for proposals for this project had required the development of a statewide plan, needs assessment, and collaboration with regional and local level early intervention personnel to develop statewide opportunities for inservice training and preservice planning. A Personnel Development Project was carefully structured by the UAP to meet these requirements. The project's design included task forces to address four major areas of personnel development, with the lead agency monitoring activity. The four task forces addressed the issues of planning and evaluation, curricula development, technical assistance, and inservice and continuing education. Task force membership was diverse, including practitioners, parents, and university personnel. Each of the four task forces was housed on different university campuses across the state and was chaired by university leaders on each campus. Both state agency and higher education representatives reported a successful first year of activity, during which time extensive needs assessments were conducted to specify the personnel preparation needs of early intervention personnel across the state.

Maintenance. Continuity of leadership was the key to consistent working relationships in "Patent." The original planners of the Part H personnel project have

stayed on, and respondents reported continued enthusiasm for the project. Opportunities to interact across state agencies and university campuses were built into the project objectives.

Finance. The lead agency awarded a sizable amount of money to personnel preparation efforts for Part H through a grant to the UAP in response to critical personnel shortages. The lead agency placed a high priority on personnel development and allocated a significant amount of Part H dollars to personnel development partly because of the strong advocacy for personnel development from key leadership at the UAP. This advocacy was based on the realization that if a system of services to infants and toddlers was to work, there needed to be extensive personnel preparation and retraining of staff.

Approximately one million dollars of state money were allocated to the development of demonstration projects for service delivery to children from birth through two years of age. This funding was in the form of planning grants awarded to projects demonstrating collaborative planning efforts for this age group, since preschool programs for children aged 3 to 5 years were well in place. University figures in "Patent" accessed federal grant money as well, utilizing grant writing skills developed through previous experimental project experience occurring prior to Part H activities.

Outcomes. The formalized effort resulted in needs-based materials development and plans for extensive, interdisciplinary, statewide personnel preparation that included parent participation. There was an emphasis on community outreach through informal and formal communication such as the wide and frequent dissemination of newsletters. Because certification and personnel preparation programs were already in place, planners could move forward to develop personnel preparation competencies and provide quality personnel to the field of early intervention.

Barriers. The major obstacle in early stages of personnel planning for "Patent" was the initial concern about a UAP taking control of the development project. While there had been opportunities for working relations to develop between the UAP and state agencies prior to the passage of Part H of IDEA, such working relations generally had involved the Department of Education, not the Department of Health and Social Services .

Summary. "Patent" was described by its representatives as a progressive state with innovative education and social service systems. Emphasis on early intervention personnel development through Part H was seen as "fine tuning" an existing service delivery system. An early childhood special education credential was already in place for working with children with disabilities from birth to 5 years of age and there were six to ten preservice university programs in the state offering the requirements necessary to earn the credential. Efforts were not without conflict, however, as strong leadership jockeyed for position in decision-making and influence in the personnel planning arena. It was necessary for the UAP to fight an "ivory tower" image to win the personnel contract by producing a pragmatic, inclusive personnel development plan. The result of this challenge was a formalized structure for addressing personnel issues, the Personnel Development Project, which successfully involved multiple campuses and agencies.

"Galena"

Origin and history. In "Galena" there were three groups with an investment in personnel preparation for early intervention: state agencies (the Department of Public Welfare and the Department of Education), personnel preparation institutions, and a network of private providers. Although a service delivery system was in place prior to Part H, there was no credentialing system for early interventionists. Services to young children with special needs were being provided by private agencies who

subcontracted through the Department of Public Welfare. This sector of professionals was a strong, coordinated, active group who had traditionally controlled the early intervention service delivery market. For example, in 1983, local education agencies were directed by the state Department of Public Welfare, in conjunction with the Department of Education, to allocate 25% of their funding to subcontracted services with existing providers. The private sector has worked to maintain control of early intervention service delivery under Part H. A professional association of providers in "Galena," representing approximately 93 agencies across the state, successfully lobbied for the early intervention mandate, and for the state Department of Public Welfare, rather than the Department of Education, to be designated as lead agency for Part H. Even though Education is not at the helm, there has been an effort to mesh these two systems that deliver services to separate age groups. The Department of Welfare targets birth to 3-year-old children, and the Department of Education is responsible for services to children from 3 through 5 years old.

Leaders in the key groups affecting early intervention (state agencies, personnel preparation institutions, and the providers' association) recognized the need to coordinate service delivery before Part H was enacted. The groups' efforts had been formalized two years prior to Part H with a state planning grant that funded planning for the organization of a system of personnel services for early intervention. The planning group included state agencies, private providers and higher education representatives and had begun planning when Part H passed. Most of the participants in the state planning grant group then became involved in Part H planning. Personnel preparation was a key issue for planners, as there was no early intervention credential to guide personnel preparation. Traditionally, professionals had earned various degrees, and then finished personnel preparation "on the job" with private agency employment.

Key figures. A variety of individuals influenced personnel development efforts. State agency personnel (e.g., the Part H coordinator) were in the forefront, articulating a vision for a seamless system that linked the Departments of Health and Welfare with the Department of Education. Educators from individual universities, rather than the State Commission of Higher Education, were active on the personnel preparation subcommittee of the ICC. Private providers, such as home-based interdisciplinary services, were also prominently active, as major stakeholders in the personnel supply. Support for early intervention also came from a legislator who successfully advocated for funding for Part H with money allocated for personnel planning.

Formalization. Structures were created and adapted to plan for personnel development, such as the personnel development subcommittee of the ICC, which included members of the previous planning group associated with the 1984 state planning grant. State agency leaders solicited representation from universities with special education departments to participate in planning. A House Education Committee of the legislature also addressed early intervention issues on its agenda, including planning for personnel development.

Maintenance. The groups involved in planning for personnel (state agencies, higher education and providers) were previously stakeholders in personnel development and have remained involved. Personnel from universities with special education personnel preparation programs were motivated to develop standards and procedures for certification that could expand early intervention programs. State agency personnel were working toward a "seamless system" of service delivery, coordinating the efforts of the Departments of Education and of Health and Welfare to ease transitions. Private providers, in addition, wanted to continue to offer services in the early intervention market.

Finance. Money for early childhood special education had recently been appropriated through the influence of the House Education Committee. Early

intervention services were mandated in December of 1990 for birth to 5 year old children, with an entitlement for direct service delivery, and money required to be allocated for personnel planning and personnel development.

Outcomes. Cooperative planning efforts have involved individuals who represented state agencies, higher education, and private providers. Together they planned new certification procedures, developed standards and competencies, and increased awareness of personnel needs. The existing service delivery system, traditionally dominated by private providers in this state, expanded to include the influence of the state legislature, individual universities, and both health and welfare state agencies and education agencies. This has resulted in increased resources and plans for improved personnel preparation.

Barriers. The involvement of diverse, deeply rooted stakeholders intensified planning for personnel development in "Galena." Planners came to the table from various state agencies and specific training institutions as well as from the private provider sector, with each group advocating a slightly different agenda for meeting Part H personnel challenges. Through the efforts of lead agency leadership and because of prior work on state planning grants, players were able to work together toward one system of personnel development and service delivery.

Several parties involved in planning, who were interviewed for this study, expressed frustration relative to the uninvolved State Commission of Higher Education. Early intervention personnel preparation programs were developed by individual universities in the absence of top-down support from this Commission.

Summary. Although the State Commission of Higher Education was not involved in planning for personnel for Part H, individual university educators became involved in planning, with an interest in developing personnel preparation programs for certification in early intervention and related fields. Unlike other states with well-established personnel preparation systems, "Galena" did not have a history of formal

personnel preparation in early intervention. This was due to some dissonance between the three stake-holding groups and their views on certification, particularly on the part of the practitioners already in the business of serving young children with disabilities and their families. Representation from the association of private providers expressed doubt about the relevance of standard certification procedures for early childhood education. Also, the paucity of personnel preparation programs available for meeting requirements for certification made it difficult for practitioners to become certified. Compliance to Part H was a catalyst for these three groups to come together.

"Gerard"

Origin and history. Personnel development for early intervention professionals working with preschool children (aged 3-5) existed in "Gerard" prior to the passage of Part H of IDEA, stimulated by university demonstration projects across the state. Working relationships between state agencies and higher education relative to personnel preparation were typically characterized by individual agencies contracting with select universities for specific needs. When Part H was enacted, a 50 member Interagency Coordinating Council was formed to include parents and professionals across the state. Efforts to coordinate personnel preparation began with the Council's appointing personnel preparation focus groups. In Year 3 of planning, the 50 member body became an advisory council and a 15 member State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), which met the membership requirements under Part H, continued to advise and assist the lead agency. This 15 member council had previously been called the Administrative Board of the larger SICC. Both councils were involved in personnel development in a problem-solving capacity.

Key figures. The planning project for Part H was originally headed by three key figures who were experienced in early intervention practice and policy development. Theirs was an inclusive approach to planning, involving everyone who had a stake or

interest in early intervention, such as multiple representatives from higher education and state agencies, service delivery, families, and professional groups. After approximately two years, the focus for personnel planning shifted from direct utilization of the larger group of planners to smaller work groups and contracts with county agencies for planning tasks. In addition to this change of focus, there was a change of leadership at this time, as the original group of leaders dissipated.

Formalization. The lead agency, Social and Health Services, designated a planning project to formalize Part H personnel development. Its assigned staff worked in conjunction with the personnel preparation subcommittee of the ICC, which included higher education representatives. A personnel plan was developed collaboratively between the project and the focus group. Its final product was contracted out to a university faculty member for completion. The plan generated much discussion in terms of feasibility and ease of implementation. At the time of data collection for this study, consensus from the SICC or county level ICCs had not been reached for approval of the plan.

Maintenance. Working relationships between personnel planning participants changed as leadership changed, and as the focus of the project shifted from large to small group planning. When the group of 50+ participants became an advisory council, they were not as directly involved in planning. Continuity for planning was also affected by a temporary emphasis on the application process for fourth year Part H funding that occupied the SICC and lead agency at the time of interviews for this study.

Finance. The personnel preparation planning project was staffed by and supported with Part H monies through the lead agency. Some activities were contracted out, such as the writing of the personnel development plan. Special education and related services are mandated for 3-5 year olds, but early intervention services for the birth to age 3 population was not a mandate and was without state

funding. Part H funding continued to be used to enhance planning and service outcomes for an early intervention state-wide system that follows requirements of Part H of IDEA, Year 4.

Outcomes. The planning project and collaborators had developed a plan for personnel preparation that was undergoing revisions at the time of interviews. Early intervention personnel preparation events were in place in "Gerard," through the cooperation of the lead agency and specific universities or through cooperative efforts between the Department of Education and specific universities and through related SICC activities. Participation in personnel planning also stimulated other higher education representatives to make individual efforts to increase early intervention personnel preparation in their own programs.

Barriers. The transition from the broad based advisory council to the leadership of the 15 member ICC was difficult for participants involved in early personnel development. During this transition there was expressed frustration in terms of loss and uncertainty surrounding leadership changes and what was perceived by personnel developers as slow progress in the approval of the personnel development plan. Without a mandate for services to children from birth to age 3, participants questioned state commitment to early intervention efforts.

Summary. Personnel planning was undergoing major transitions at the time of interviews for this study, including shifts in leadership and ICC membership. Planning and policy development were in process, and state clarity and agreement on personnel development issues had not been reached. This process was complicated by the lack of an early intervention mandate and insufficient state funding. Emphasis on application for year 4 Part H funding, in process at the time of data collection, had interrupted the flow of collaboration and delayed movement toward the mission of the lead agency and SICC: statewide, coordinated, comprehensive personnel development.

"Roald"

Origin and history. As in many other states, early projects that involved both state agencies and higher education targeted young children with handicaps in "Roald." These projects were usually administered by state agency personnel who recognized the need for staff development for practitioners, and requested personnel preparation services from universities with early childhood programs. Some of the same individuals involved in administration and personnel preparation for earlier projects became involved in personnel planning for Part H when it passed.

Key figures. Individuals from the universities in "Roald" who provided early intervention personnel preparation became involved in personnel planning and remained constant through changes in leadership of the "Roald" State Board of Education. One nationally known figure, well-published in the area of personnel preparation innovations for practitioners who work with special needs populations, was in the forefront throughout planning efforts and remained the key leader. The higher education constituency had an established reputation for being on the cutting edge of research and development for early childhood special education and held the respect of other entities, such as the "Roald" State Board of Education.

Formalization. The personnel preparation task force of the ICC was chaired by the aforementioned university key leader. The group was composed of a member from each of 10 disciplines representing both faculty and providers, as well as parent members, a representative from an advocacy group, and three state agency people. An early decision on the part of personnel development leadership was to change the task force's status to that of a "standing committee." This move increased political advantage for personnel planning. The group has completed its Comprehensive System of Personnel Development plan (CSPD) and a proposal for two new occupational categories. These are two infancy specialization positions, Child

Development Specialist and Family Support Specialist. Both positions have been approved, and competencies are being developed with future plans for some type of credentialing process.

Maintenance. The task oriented personnel preparation committee had plans to continue meeting to work on implementation strategies. The lead agency, the "Roald" State Board of Education, also was active in bringing people together. Its staff sponsored an early intervention conference that included state agency personnel, trainers, practitioners, families, and professional associations.

Finance. Part H funding was spent primarily on expansion of services, rather than on infrastructure. Planning activities, such as personnel development, continued despite lack of money.

Outcomes. The work of the lead agency and the personnel subcommittee produced materials such as technical assistance training manuals, events such as faculty institutes, research, and a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development plan. The new competency-based occupational categories, not yet at the implementation stage at the time of the interviews, were developed by the standing committee. Due to broad based participation, the committee had succeeded in involving a large number of people in planning and needs assessment for training in special services, with support from the State Board of Education.

Barriers. Major barriers to Part H personnel development for "Roald" included limited funding, and turnover in state agency personnel. Long-term working relationships across state agency and higher education domains were not universally in place at the outset of Part H planning for personnel. Key figures coming to the collaborative planning table represented varying backgrounds in training and philosophy.

Summary. Personnel planning efforts in "Roald" were strongly influenced by key university leadership. For the most part, this leadership was respected and

supported by the lead agency ("Roald" State Board of Education). Collaboration, however, was limited by personnel changes in the State Board of Education and differences in backgrounds and philosophies within key groups. It was anticipated that these differences would complicate and lengthen implementation of certification procedures for the new early intervention occupational categories proposed by the personnel committee.

Cross-state Analysis

The five case studies revealed variety in the responses to common concerns relative to personnel planning for Part H. The uniqueness of each state was apparent in conditions that supported or discouraged cooperative planning. Existing conditions that affected personnel planning were:

- the history of the state on matters related to education, early intervention, and working relationships
- key persons in the state who were activists for early intervention; resources that were available for planning and implementation of personnel preparation
- barriers inherent in the culture of each state, such as political climate

Planning action was an outgrowth of existing conditions in each state as attempts were made to address personnel planning issues such as certification within the constraints of state culture. Action included the formalization of the planning efforts for Part H, maintenance of cooperative working relationships, and movement toward goals and outcome objectives.

Trends and patterns were categorized and analyzed according to the areas of inquiry described above. Key phrases that characterized the significant trend for each state per area of inquiry were compiled on a matrix and presented below in Table 1.

Table 1. Cross-state analysis

	Origin and history	Key figures	Formalization	Maintenance	Finance	Outcomes	Barriers
Dickens	existence of established network of players	consistency of players	implementation of established procedures	establishment of reciprocal participation	resources of time & expertise a contributing factor	establishment of infant specialist credentialing	complexity of bureaucratic interagency procedures
Patent	history of progressive initiative	collaboration between prominent leadership and agency personnel	development of statewide plan & collaboration of 4 major area task forces	continuity of leadership	funding supplemented by grants to higher education	development of personnel preparation programs; information dissemination	conflict between 'ivory tower' and pragmatists
Galena	existence of strong association of private early intervention providers	key state agency players, educators, private providers	adaptation by state & university for personnel development	recognition of stake-holders & coordination of efforts of diverse providers	mandate with entitlement for direct service & personnel development	development of plans for a credentialing system & expansion of delivery system	diversity of health and education provider systems
Gerard	shift in planning strategies	shift from 3 key leaders to smaller work groups and contracts	designation of planning project for personnel preparation	regrouping of players	no early intervention mandate	development of plan for cooperative efforts in communication & participation	personnel perception of slow progress
Roald	existence of early projects involving state agencies and university	continuance of consistent leadership	change of status of task force to standing committee	continuation of efforts to implement personnel plan	emphasis on expansion of services, not infrastructure	production of materials; events; research	lack of money; personnel changes

In addition to significant trends, cross-state analysis revealed response patterns consistent with existing conditions. Respondents from states that demonstrated consistent leadership, such as "Dickens" and "Patent," provided interview data containing rich histories in conjunction with present-day description of cooperation. In "Roald," past efforts were not reported to be particularly relevant to Part H; thus data pertaining to the past were of less importance.

Although information as to the financing of personnel planning was solicited, interview respondents, particularly in "Dickens," "Gerard," and "Roald" did not convey details, possibly due to lack of detailed knowledge in this area. In these states, rather than speaking specifically to money, the general area of resources was addressed, such as the time and energy that were reciprocated in cooperative working relationships. Interview data from "Galena" and "Patent" contained frequent mention of specific sums of money available to Part H. In all five states, respondents were consistently aware of key persons from both higher education and state agencies who were defined as those critical to that state's early intervention history.

Variance in the level of activity for Part H planning was also notable in cross-state analysis. "Roald," for example, was in the first stages of formalized personnel development for Part H. Therefore, formalization and maintenance responses were not as strong as those from states further along in policy development. Formalization elicited a strong response in states where formal structures were organized to address personnel issues, such as "Patent's" Personnel Development Project. Data relative to maintenance reflected states' ability to continue planning efforts with movement toward implementation. In "Gerard," this data indicated a change of direction in planning processes. Response to inquiry about outcomes demonstrated results of cooperation with implications for movement toward implementation. Both "Galena" and "Patent" reported products and new personnel preparation opportunities as a result of collaboration. "Dickens" had developed a credentialing process for infant and

preschool specialists. Other states spoke to further plans for personnel preparation, credentialing and materials that had not yet been produced.

DISCUSSION

Attributes of Successful Collaborative Personnel Planning for Part H

There were key characteristics specific to states that were able to establish and maintain linkages between state agencies and higher education. It was evident that states whose mission was traditionally inclusive of education in general, and early intervention specifically, accepted the Part H mandate and moved forward with it more quickly. For personnel preparation, this type of existing state condition facilitated progress, particularly when higher education had traditionally initiated research and experimental health and/or education projects in conjunction with state government. These preconditions smoothed the path for Part H personnel planning.

Value placed on the phenomenon of progress could also be attributed to states in which focus of planning included a forward view with implementation in its sights. An example of this was time spent on assessment of needs prior to establishment of a plan. States with a general motivation to make headway tended to place less emphasis on establishing and maintaining an organizational structure, and more emphasis on processes. This attribute kept the wheels lubricated, and such states were more apt to demonstrate planning outcomes.

Consistency of leadership in either higher education, state agencies, or both, proved to be a key characteristic of successful collaborative planning. Key figures who were indigenous to a state had contacts and linkages, were knowledgeable about resources, and were able to gain access for support for personnel preparation issues. Their visibility also served as an inspiration, focus, and example to other early intervention activists in the state.

Professional organizations were often active in states that exhibited cooperation. Their presence acted as a third party for higher education and state agency interactions, and the perspective of the practitioner increased validity of planning. With this level of stakeholder providing input, chances for actual change were increased, as compatibility of planning and practice increased.

Support from high level policy makers was crucial to successful planning, maintenance of efforts, and movement toward implementation. Results of collaboration among higher education and state agencies were limited without advocacy from those controlling, or influencing the controllers of, the purse strings.

Available monetary resources were advantageous to states making progress in personnel development. More often cited by interview respondents, however, was the importance of other resources, such as time and expertise. Access to time and expertise were seen as commodities related to the flexibility of the state agency or university organization to allow release time for personnel to attend meetings for Part H planning.

A key common denominator among states that demonstrated successful cooperative planning for personnel was what Peters and Waterman called a "bias for action" (1982). There were, for example, central events such as collaborative conferences early in the stages of planning that targeted vital groups and solicited input for personnel development. Formal structures were put in place to consistently address personnel issues. Communication was widespread, which allowed knowledgeable participation across organizational boundaries. Key figures were process oriented, acted with foresight, and paved the way toward implementation by focusing on processes to facilitate personnel program development based on needs. Key persons also demonstrated a willingness to take initiative, and an openness to new ideas.

In sum, a state's bias for action served to welcome and reward innovation. Each state's unique bias for action, or lack thereof, was a crucial factor in effecting change, because outcome variables were a function of the interwoven influences of action and existing conditions. Action was enhanced or discouraged by existing conditions in each state: its unique culture, state history, political climate and available resources. A bias for action was part of the state's culture: a tradition of progress, a tradition of working together. In successfully cooperative case study states, action was compatible with state culture, encouraging progress in planning for personnel development.

Common Issues Addressed by States in Planning for Personnel Development

Among the themes and patterns that emerged from data relative to planning were various approaches to some shared issues. Certification, for example, emerged as a leading influence on the status of personnel preparation in each state. States where certification was in place, such as "Patent," already had competency based personnel preparation programs underway. States proposing new occupational categories, such as "Dickens" and "Roald," needed time to develop competencies and standards for such positions. In "Galena," where services had traditionally been delivered by uncertified personnel, a resistance to certification had to be addressed before plans and procedures could be developed.

The status of state legislation also affected personnel preparation progress. States with an entitlement for services to children aged 3-5 had moved further ahead in thinking about service delivery personnel than states that had recently acquired, or were in the process of acquiring, legislation for early intervention.

Where there was legislation, there were state resources for service delivery. These monies were usually channeled into direct services, rather than into personnel planning, however. Some federal Part H funds were usually made available for

planning. The issue of limited resources was raised not only in terms of planning and implementation, but also as a disincentive for potential trainees. There was general concern that the tradition of low wages for personnel working with young children would thwart the best of planners' intentions.

Movement toward actual implementation of personnel preparation planning was associated with states' outreach efforts. Most states reported concern for offering personnel preparation opportunities throughout the state, although this was difficult in states with large rural districts. Widespread information dissemination efforts were an attempt to increase knowledge and awareness of personnel preparation opportunities. States more successful in serving rural areas were those whose formal personnel development plans included an outreach component. An example of this is the "Patent" Personnel Development Project which, in response to the guidelines of the lead agency's request for proposals, divided the project into four task forces that were housed across the state, rather than centralizing the project at the state capitol.

Interagency cooperation as well as inter-sector cooperation underlay the collaborative efforts of planners for Part H personnel. There was often lack of communication between divisions of the state agencies. The participation of university personnel in planning sometimes helped bridge this gap, but inter-campus and intra-campus cooperation were also in need of attention according to higher education representatives. A dissonance within higher education, typical of relations between state agencies and higher education, was evident, although awareness of organizational differences actually served as a catalyst for cooperation in some states. Inter-system cooperation and understanding continues to develop in most of the case study states. The domains of education and health, though traditionally separated both in university and state agency settings, were working toward cooperation for mutual goals. However, professional boundaries and chronic turf issues continue as a hindrance to the realization of collaboration among systems of health and education.

Policy Implications

A state's "bias for action" was a factor in determining the structure, processes, and procedures for facilitating cooperation. Planning efforts were structured by the creation of ongoing formal groups, such as the personnel development committees of the ICC and personnel development projects. Formal groups allowed interaction among participants, and were vehicles for collaboration across sectors, agencies, and professional disciplines.

Enabling processes included communication, both formal and informal, that took place during gatherings such as meetings and events, and through written information dissemination, such as newsletters. Key leadership in both higher education and state agencies guided processes by articulating a vision of early intervention for eligible children, encouraging new ideas to facilitate change and implementation, and marshalling resources for personnel preparation. Successful planning procedures also tended to include broad based input from a variety of stakeholders including providers, families, and trainers.

The inherent diversity in the case study states, as well as in the rest of the nation, prohibits a standard recipe for successful personnel planning. Indepth case study analysis of these states and their personnel planning efforts would, however, suggest that policies should reflect a bias for action, an eye toward implementation, and compatibility with state culture. In states that demonstrated successful planning for personnel development, it was a commitment to improved service delivery and innovation, from multiple levels of committed players -- practitioners to legislators -- that stimulated change.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this report generated the following policy recommendations for states attempting to achieve cooperation in personnel development for Part H.

1. Establish a Higher Education-State Agency Consortium

We recommend following the example of states that demonstrated progress in personnel development by utilizing a formal planning structure to bring state agency and interdisciplinary higher education, as well as professional organization representatives to the drawing board. Such a structure should be established as permanent, with regularly scheduled meetings. Its recommended agenda would include long term, statewide planning for special education across the board, not limited to early intervention. Its workscope might encompass information dissemination for increased awareness of personnel preparation activities, and encouragement of community and rural outreach. Resources would be contributed from each of the vested parties to ensure maintenance of the consortium and successful task completion.

2. Provide Financial Incentives for Higher Education

We recommend the use of incentives from the state in terms of scholarships or faculty support to draw higher education into early education personnel development. In today's climate of retrenchment, universities are unlikely to expand programs without support from the state, a point well made by Deans of Schools of Education in a recent survey (Gallagher & Staples, 1990). The monetary cost need not be exorbitant: the guarantee of a single tenured faculty position, for example, may be a sufficient attractor.

3. Establish Memoranda of Understanding to Link Sectors

We recommend an inter-sector procedure to delineate duties of a contractual nature, similar to those employed by case study states such as "Dickens." Its procedure is a written agreement that established a semi-formal link between state agencies and higher education in terms of needs and mutual goals on collaborative projects. Though not binding, it clarifies roles of the participants and allows for adjustment and change. Such memoranda provide a type of institutional memory of past commitments and intentions.

REFERENCES

Bailey, D., Simeonsson, R., Yoder, D., & Huntington, G. (1990). Preparing professionals to serve infants and toddlers with handicaps and their families: An integrative analysis across eight disciplines. Exceptional Children, 57,1, 26-34.

Bruder, M., Klosowski, S. & Daguio, C. (1989). Personnel standards for ten professional disciplines serving children under P.L. 99-457: Results from a national survey. Division of Child and Family Studies, Department of Pediatrics, University of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT.

Fisher, L. (1988). State legislatures and the autonomy of colleges and universities. Journal of Higher Education, 59, 2.

Gallagher, J. (1989). Planning for personnel preparation (Public Law 99-457, Part H). Policy Alert. Carolina Policy Studies Program, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Gallagher, J. & Coleman, P. (1990). Professional organizations' role in meeting the personnel demands of Part H, P.L. 99-457. Carolina Policy Studies Program, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Gallagher, J., Harbin, G., Thomas, D., Clifford, R., & Wenger, M. (1988). Major policy issues in implementing Part H - P.L. 99-457 (infants and toddlers). Carolina institute for Child and Family Policy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Gallagher, J. & Staples, A. (1990). Available and potential personnel preparation resources for special education of infants and toddlers, deans' survey. Carolina Policy Studies Program, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Harbin, G., Gallagher, J., & Lillie, T. (1991). Status of states' progress in implementing Part H of IDEA: Report 3#. Carolina Policy Studies Program, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Palsha, S. & Rennells, M. (1990). Staffing infant intervention programs: One state's status and future direction. Carolina Institute for Child and Family Policy, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. Harper & Row: NY.

Slaughter, S. (1988). Academic freedom and the state. Journal of Higher Education, 59, 3.

Yoder, D., Coleman, P., & Gallagher, J. (1990). Personnel needs - Allied health personnel meeting the demands of Part H, P.L. 99-457. Carolina Institute for Child and Family Policy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

APPENDIX A

CAROLINA POLICY STUDIES PROGRAM

Interview Questionnaire
Higher Education - State Agency Cooperation
P.L. 99-457 and Personnel Preparation

Name of Interviewee_____
Date_____

1. How did the existing cooperative effort toward personnel preparation develop between higher education and the state agency?

What was the motivation for establishing cooperation between your agency and the institution of higher education?

What were specific conditions that contributed to a decision to make this effort?

2. Who initiated the cooperative effort?

Did the idea originate in higher education?

From the state agency?

From elsewhere?

3. Were there key figures involved in formulating the collaborative relationship? If so, who were they?

What proportion of success could be attributed to their personal influence?

4. How was the relationship formalized?

Was there a written agreement?

An informal understanding?

5. How is the cooperation/collaboration maintained?

What are the linkages between the two organizations?

How are agendas shared?

Is there a reciprocal incentive/pay-off for each participant?

What are the incentives/motivations for continued cooperation?

To what extent is the relationship open to examination and reconstruction by one or both participants?

6. How are issues between higher education and the state agency addressed (accreditation, standards for personnel preparation, e.g.)?

How are conflicts resolved?

7. Is there a financial dimension to the cooperation?

Do funds change hands between the two parties as part of the agreement? For example, does the agency provide support for personnel preparation in higher education?

Do the higher education institutions provide scholarships, assistantships, etc.?

8. What have been the results of the cooperative effort? (Please include examples if possible.)

9. Is there any other information that would be helpful to us in understanding this relationship?